

**REMARKS**

Applicant hereby traverses the current objections and rejections, and request reconsideration and withdrawal in light of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

**Rejections to the Claims**

Claims 25-38 are pending in the present application, having been rejected as follows:

- Claims 25-33 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Head U.S. Patent No. 6,112,813 (hereinafter “Head”).
- Claims 33-38 were not addressed in the current office action. Therefore, Applicant believes claims 33-38 are in condition for allowance.

Applicant respectfully traverses the outstanding rejections, and requests reconsideration and withdrawal thereof in light of the remarks contained herein.

**35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, the prior art cited must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. See M.P.E.P. § 2143. Applicant asserts that the rejection does not satisfy such criteria.

*Independent Claim 25*

Applicant has amended independent claim 25. Claim 25 now recites, in part, that the optical fibers have “a helical pitch configuration inside the tubing sufficient to provide frictional hold-up force between the outer surface of the one or more optical fibers and the inner surface of the tubing for the one or more optical fibers to support its weight in the tubing.” *Head* does not teach or suggest the feature of helical pitch providing hold up force for the optical fibers. Rather, *Head* teaches using a filler material to reduce stresses and support the internal conduit, as well as to transfer weight from the internal conduit to the coiled tubing. Because *Head* teaches using a filler material for such purposes, one of ordinary skill in the art would not recognize to use the claimed helical pitch configuration. Accordingly, *Head* fails to teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Applicant therefore respectfully requests the rejection be withdrawn.

*Dependent Claims 26-38*

Claims 26-38 depend from claim 25. Accordingly, claim 26-38 are asserted to be patentable over the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejections of record for at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 25.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the above, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Applicant believes no fee, other than a one month extension fee, is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 06-2375, under Order No. HO-P03359US0 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: November 9, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By /J. Reid Bumgarner /  
J. Reid Bumgarner  
Registration No.: 56,761  
FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P.  
Fulbright Tower  
1301 McKinney, Suite 5100  
Houston, Texas 77010-3095  
(713) 651-5151  
(713) 651-5246 (Fax)  
Attorney for Applicant